



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,687	12/11/2006	Jacques Benveniste	NY-GRYN 229-US	3404
24972 7590 05/01/2008 FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP 666 FIFTH AVE NEW YORK, NY 10103-3198				
EXAMINER				
COOK, LISA V				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1641				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/01/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/563,687

Applicant(s)

BENVENISTE, JACQUES

Examiner

LISA V. COOK

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/28/07
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Status

1. Examiner Cook phoned Applicants representative C. Andrew Im (Reg. No. 40,657) on 3/12/08 to verify the number of claims pending in the instant application. Two sets of claims appear on edan and Applicant has paid the fee for only nine claims. Mr. Im verified that the claim set with 9 total claims is intended to be pending and under consideration.
2. Currently claims 1-9 are under consideration.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the examiner on form PTO-892 or applicant on PTO-1449 has cited the references they have not been considered.
4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed 6/28/07 has been considered as to the merits prior to First Action.

Specification

5. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
 - I. Page number "1" is not numbered.

II. The use of the trademarks has been noted in this application. (i.e. TRITON – pages 5 and 8). They should be capitalized wherever they appear or accompanied by the TM or ® symbol wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Abstract

6. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

7. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. (Claims 2-4, 6, and 8-9 are rejected as being dependent on claim 1).

A. Claim 1 is vague and indefinite because the method steps in the body of the claim do not positively correlate or recite a resolution step that relates to the preamble. As recited the claim merely reads on the detection of PMN adhesion in the presence of an extract. However, the preamble is drawn to diagnosing intolerance. This makes the claim ambiguous and the metes and bounds of the claim can not be determined. It is suggested that a correlation/resolution step directed to the preamble be added to the method steps in order to obviate this rejection. Please correct.

B. Claim 1 line 5 recites the limitation "said substance" in the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The claim should read "said specified substance". Appropriate correction is required.

C. Claim 5 recites the limitation "food extract" in the claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. *A prior* the claims merely read on an extract, not food extract. Thus claim 5 should read "extract". Appropriate correction is required.

D. Claim 7 is indefinite for being in improper Markush format. The Office recommends the use of the phrase "selected from the group consisting of..." with the use of the conjunction "and" rather than "or" in listing specifics. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

I. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Krider et al. (WO 96/40869).

Krider et al. teach methods of measuring PMNs in Lyme disease. See abstract. The method involves monitoring the surface binding (adhesion) and phagocytosis of cultured *B. burgdorferi* to naturally-occurring PMN and comparison with heparinized (lysis) whole blood from a non-infected animal. For example, see page 7 lines 29—30 for example.

In particular, a foreign substance (a specified substance) is contacted with a fluid or tissue sample from a human or animal and binding is monitored by fluorescence microscopy (claims 8 and 9). See page 8 lines 12-27. Various foreign substances are taught. See page 8 line 28 to page 9 line 10. Different antigens are detected and ELISA tests are disclosed (claims 2-6).

In considering the anticipatory effect of a reference, not only its specific teachings but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom should be taken into account.

10. For reasons aforementioned, no claims are allowed.

Remarks

11. Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure:

A. Tellado et al. (Journal of Leukocyte Biology, Vol.50, 1991, pages 547-553)
disclose PMN activation in anergic patients.

12. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. The Group 1641 – Central Fax number is (571) 273-8300, which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week. In the event Applicant would like to fax an unofficial communication, the Examiner should be contacted for the appropriate Right Fax number.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa V. Cook whose telephone number is (571) 272-0816. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, can be reached on (571) 272-0823.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Group TC 1600 whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 1641

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lisa V. Cook
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1641
Remsen 3C-59
571-272-0816

/Lisa V. Cook/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1641